

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 20 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 9, 18 and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 11 remain independent.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

Claims 1-8, 10-14, 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matthews, III et al, hereinafter "Matthews" (U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Matthews is directed to a hyperlink system in an electronic programming guide (EPG). In Matthews, the hyperlinks may be placed in the program titles, channel titles or description data. Thus, when a viewer activates a hyperlink within the EPG, the user interface unit launches the browser to activate the target resource specified by the hyperlink and the data retrieved from the target resource is then displayed on a display unit. However, Matthews does not teach or suggest the feature of displaying television picture size information as part of the simple data information picture in advance.

In clear contrast, in Applicants' embodied invention, the television picture size information, which identifies the size of the general television picture to be displayed if the viewer selects to view the data information picture, is displayed as part of the simple data information picture in advance.

Since the viewer can see what the size of the television picture would be if the user were to select to view the data information picture, the viewer can decide if he or she wants to select and view the data information picture by considering the television picture size information in advance. This is advantageous because it allows the viewer to know what to expect in advance if the viewer were to select to view the data information picture.

Furthermore, another advantage of Applicants' embodied invention is a feature of displaying the simple data information picture on a present audition television picture as a font having a translucent ground in order to enable a viewer to view the present audition television picture with the simple data information picture superimposed over the audition television picture. Accordingly, for example, when the viewer selects the "simple data information picture", the present invention has the effect that the present television picture is displayed as it is, and the font having the translucent ground for informing the title information, television display size information, and related link information is also displayed superimposed on the present television picture without having to switch out of the currently displayed television picture. This feature is neither taught nor suggested by Matthews, as correctly acknowledged by the Examiner on page 8, lines 14-17 of the last Office Action dated November 24, 2003.

Therefore, Matthews fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*:

wherein the summary information extracting

process comprises extracting television picture size defining information of each HTML page, and

wherein the simple data information picture is displayed on a present audition television picture as a font having a translucent ground in order to enable a viewer to view the present audition television picture with the simple data information picture superimposed over the audition television picture

as recited in independent claim 1;

wherein in the step of displaying the simple data information, the simple data information includes . . . television picture size information identifying a picture size of the general television picture to be displayed with a detailed version of the data information, and

wherein the simple data information picture is displayed on a present audition television picture as a font having a translucent ground in order to enable a viewer to view the present audition television picture with the simple data information picture superimposed over the audition television picture

as recited in independent claim 7;

where the simple data information picture includes . . . a picture size information identifying a picture size of the general television picture to be displayed with a different version of the data information, and

wherein the simple data information picture is displayed on a present audition television picture as a font having a translucent ground in order to enable a viewer to view the present audition television picture with the simple data information picture superimposed over the audition television picture

as recited in independent claim 8; and

the simple data information includes . . . television picture size information identifying a picture size of the general television picture to be displayed with a detailed version of the data information, and

wherein the simple data information picture is displayed on a present audition television picture as a font having a translucent ground in order to enable a viewer to view the present audition television picture with the simple data information picture superimposed over the audition television picture

as recited in independent claim 11.

Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 9, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Conrad et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,208). In view that the subject matter of claim 9 has been added to independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 11, and in view that claims 9, 18 and 19 are cancelled, this rejection is addressed as it may pertain to now amended independent claims.

As discussed above, independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 11 are patentable over Matthews since Matthews fails to teach or suggest at least the above-noted features recited in each of the independent claims. Furthermore, Conrad et al. does not overcome this deficiency of Matthews for the following reasons.

Conrad et al. is directed to a window management mechanism which allows a user to open a window as a drawer or a pop up/temporary window as shown in Figs. 8A-9E. However, the temporary window is not and cannot be equal to Applicants' simple data information picture displayed on the present

audition television picture as a *font* having a translucent ground. Further, Conrad et al. nowhere discloses the feature of having the television picture size defining information, which is displayed in advance to the viewer as part of the simple data information picture. Therefore, even if the references are combinable, assuming *argendo*, the combination of reference would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in each of the independent claims. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Peyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,401), further in view of Garber (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,616). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Matthews fails to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 11 from which claims 15 and 16 depend. Further, Peyer et al. and Garber do not overcome this deficiency of Matthews because Peyer et al. and Garber are directed to using Java Script and CSS Parser, respectively, and have nothing to do with the claimed invention. Therefore, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 11 and its dependent claims due to their dependency. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicit an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant(s) respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and 1.17 for a one month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By *James T. Eller, Jr.* *Chg #40,953*
James T. Eller, Jr. #39,538

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

u
JTE/EHC:lmh